DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 573 FL 022 416

AUTHOR	Garcia, Gilbert Narro
TITLE	Bilingual Education: A Look to the Year 2000. Focus: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, 9.
INSTITUTION	National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	94
CONTRACT	T292008001
NOTE	20p.; Paper based on lecture delivered at the Interactive Teleconference sponsored by the Title VII Multifunctional Resource Center at California State Polytechnic University (Pomona, CA, December 6, 1993).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; *Bilingual Education; Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Expectation; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; Futures (of Society); Government Role; Higher Education; Limited English Speaking; Parent Role; Public Agencies; Public Policy; State Government
IDENTIFIERS	Improving Americans Schools Act 1994; National Education Goals 1990; School to Work Opportunities Act 1993

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the future of education for language-minority students in the United States looks at proposed legislation and other government initiatives and prevailing educational reform movements. It is argued that reform in this country must begin with a change in attitudes toward and expectations of language-minority and limited-English-speaking students, and followed up with carefully planned instructional approaches. Significant recent initiatives are cited, including the National Educational Goals statements, Goals 2000--The Educate America Act of 1993, the School to Work Opportunities Act, and the Improving America's Schools Act, the reenactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is proposed that to create and sustain the change needed, two elements will be required: bold, innovative action and certain specific expectations of schools, state education agencies, colleges and universities, parents, and the Department of Education. Expectations for each of these groups are outlined, and a vision of the future of education in the United States is offered. A list of references, a brief annotated bibliography, and a list of resource organizations and projects are appended. (MSE)

FOCUS

ED 373 573

BILINGUAL EDUCATION:
A LOOK TO THE YEAR 2000

GILBERT NARRO GARCIA

Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education

9

Spring 1994

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Gomez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL022416

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T292008001 by The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

Director: Joel Gómez

Publications Manager: Omar Shabka

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

Bilingual Education:

A Look to the Year 2000

This paper is based on a lecture delivered by the author on December 6, 1993, at the Interactive Teleconference sponsored by the Title VII Multifunctional Resource Center at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA (MRC 14). The author offers his vision of the future of education for language minority students, based upon proposed legislation and other government initiatives and prevailing reform movements evident today.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: A LOOK TO THE YEAR 2000

In Germany, the movement is called "die Reform." In Japan, they are enchanted with a concept called "Resutora"—the Japanese pronunciation of the English word "restructuring." The idea is being implemented in manufacturing, financial, and education settings. In Mexico, they refer to "la reforma educativa" to describe their education reform efforts. In the United States, terms such as "restructure," "realign," and "systemic" are used to refer to our reform efforts.

The chief characteristic of our age is that we face numerous fundamental reform movements that promise to reshape our society. Newspapers and magazines are filled with stories about the need to redefine, change, and reform basic institutional structures. The number and types of reforms are astounding. The call to reform extends to these areas:

- government and the ways we accommodate the various political interests and demands;
- health, ethics, and the judicial system;
- corporate structure and business practices;
- religious institutions;
- the arts;
- family structure and roles and expectations for parents and children;
- welfare and other social services;
- policies related to immigration, national subsidies, and foreign trade;
- the role of the United States in international affairs; and
- science and technology, especially in the dramatic innovations in the field of information technology for synthesizing and disseminating information to different audiences.

The education reform movement is no exception to these massive national and global realignments of roles and functions, and it is not surprising that school reform is a primary concern to many of the nation's citizens. After all, the quality of education in this country is the engine that must drive all these other advances. However, the condition of education is considered by many observers to be a catastrophe, despite many isolated successes. The conditions we see today are the result of years of national neglect, especially in our inner cities and rural areas. The problems schools face are also the result of our limited responses to significant and widespread changes in community demographics during the past ten years, such as the increasing number of children and youth who come from single-parent homes, the number of recent immigrants, and the number of youth and children who come from homes in crime and drug-ridden neighborhoods.

Now we must face the issues directly to improve the academic and linguistic opportunities for all

students, especially language minority and limited English proficient (LEP) students. The first step toward meaningful reform in the education of LEP students is to reform our attitudes and expectations of them. For example, if we believe that LEP students cannot learn and achieve at the same levels as their English proficient peers, we have no motivation to improve the opportunities we provide to them and they, in turn, will continue to perform poorly and drop out of school in record numbers. This inevitably leads our schools as a whole to continue to decline to even lower levels. Our fundamental belief must be that language minority and LEP students are fully capable of achieving academic success. The next step is to back up this belief with carefully planned actions and provide these students with equal opportunities to learn and achieve, through either sound and comprehensive programs of bilingual education or other carefully planned instructional approaches.

Educators must seize the moment, while there is a critical mass of energy, and focus to create change in the right direction for our schools and our students. The energy and talent devoted to each of the reform movements provide the very momentum for us to improve our public schools. All of us—students, educators, parents, and concerned citizens—have the opportunity to reshape the place we call "school." We can expand its boundaries and perhaps then break them down; we can alter the school's role as a site for teaching, learning, and growing; and we can make it a place for growing up to be respectful and tolerant of self and others. We have the unparalleled opportunity to redefine the character of schools and, ultimately, of its citizens.

PROPOSED INITIATIVES FOR SCHOOL REFORM

There are a number of important initiatives that represent different routes we can take on our journey toward meaningful school reform. The first initiative was the formulation of the *National Education Goals Statements*. This document represents one of the most important developments in the national school reform movement in the past 25 years. Its six statements declare our intentions about how our schools need to change in order to serve us as a nation. The statements posit that schooling is not only for children and youth but a lifelong endeavor for adults as well. They also have initiated discussions about the essential content of instruction and the need for school restructuring efforts as the essential response to poorly performing schools. However, in order to make good on these goals, we need structure, clear federal and state policies, and a full commitment by the nation. Since 1989, the *National Education Goals Statements* and their underlying concepts have served as the foundation for three more current and substantive reform proposals submitted to the U.S. Congress in 1993 by President Bill Clinton and Secretary of Education Richard Riley.

The second initiative is *Goals 2000—The Educate America Act of 1993*. This systemic reform bill is based on two fundamental concepts: every child in every school in the nation can work toward and achieve high standards, and schools and communities have the obligation to provide every child with the opportunity to achieve at high levels. Enacted into legislation on March 26, 1994, this bill will further the development of voluntary national curriculum and performance standards and provide funding to state education agencies (SEAs) to develop education reform plans to help local school districts implement the standards.

The third initiative is the *School To Work Opportunities Act*. This systemic reform bill is designed to put into place structures that guarantee that every American student graduates from high school with the knowledge, skills, and experience necessary whether to continue with higher education or to find productive employment. The underlying concept of this legislation is that schools will work with business and industry to delineate mutual roles and expectations. This will bring these two sectors together.

The fourth initiative, the *Improving America's Schools Act*, is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which is designed to ensure that students, especially those with the greatest needs, are provided with increased opportunities to achieve. The following five principles guide the proposals:

- high standards for all children;
- a focus on teaching and learning;
- flexibility to stimulate school reform, coupled with responsibility for improving performance of all students;
- better linkages between schools and parents and the community; and
- resources targeted to where needs are greatest and in amounts sufficient to make a difference.

DETERMINING DIRECTIONS FOR THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND

If we are to create and sustain effective schoolwide instructional programs for all students, especially bilingual education programs for LEP students, for the year 2000 and beyond, then each facet of our education system must be prepared to take bold, innovative directions. Defining these directions is part of the reauthorization proposals for the Bilingual Education Act, which is Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

If bilingual education programs are to improve significantly by the year 2000 and if such programs are to continue to play a substantive role in our national school improvement efforts, then it is necessary to have certain expectations for our schools, state education agencies, colleges and universities (IHEs), parents, and the U.S. Department of Education (ED).

FIRST, WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT FROM OUR SCHOOLS?

First of all, we should expect our schools to provide curriculum standards-driven programs of bilingual education and other instruction for LEP and other students, the same as for every other school program. Integrated bilingual education programs should be at the core of the system at the school and district levels. Also, programs financed by federal, state, and local funding sources should help schools operate unified and comprehensive schoolwide and districtwide programs of instruction for all students.

We should expect systemwide bilingual education programs focused on effective instructional strategies such as problem-based and project-based learning, socratic teaching principles, use of authentic problems, peer tutoring, and collaborative learning. These methods are the ones used in successful classrooms, especially for gifted and talented students.

We should also expect bilingual education programs that have the explicit objective of developing students' English language proficiency and, to the extent possible, developing the native or second language proficiency of limited English *and* English proficient students to increase the number of bilingual high school graduates and, ultimately, the number of bilingual professionals in the nation.

We should expect bilingual education programs to be coordinated across all grades and linked across schools in the district from Home Start, Head Start, and Even Start programs to elementary and secondary schools. This requires 12-month and multi-year schooling plans that ensure sustained education opportunities for all students, including postsecondary education.

We should expect the use of prescriptive student profiles linked to school reform plans, including curriculum and performance standards frameworks. School personnel profiles should also be used to coordinate staff resources with instructional approaches and program resources. This calls for sustained year-round professional development to provide opportunities for teachers to become proficient in and be able to teach in English and another language.

We should also expect bilingual education programs in which teaching and learning strategies are supported by the use of interactive education technologies that help document program accountability on the basis of performance standards (student achievement) and performance indicators (program-level accomplishments), and guide staff to gauge the impact of the program on systemic school reform objectives. Finally, we should expect schools to identify the best instructional and management practices as proven by sound assessments to build and sustain institutional capacity to serve students. This means, in part, that schools must strive to use the information to upgrade and restructure teaching and learning rather than facilitate the emergence of alternative schooling opportunities.

NEXT, WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT FROM STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES (SEAs)?

First, we should expect SEAs to be providing guidance on all of the reforms carried out at the school and district level. In addition, they should articulate policies regarding the education of all students, with statements about their responsibilities regarding LEP students in the context of curriculum, performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards.

We should expect SEAs to provide leadership in the development and full implementation of state reform plans that address the teaching and learning requirements of all students. They should also be expected to provide leadership in the development and full implementation of reform plans at every school district, with objectives and strategies integrally linked to the state's reform plans, especially in schools with high concentrations of low-income and/or LEP students.

SEAs should also be expected to lead the way in the development of curriculum frameworks for all students, but with specific guidance on how schools are expected to ensure that LEP students achieve to the high standards projected for all students. SEAs should also be expected to provide the staffing and technical assistance resources needed to implement schoolwide and districtwide programs of bilingual education.

SEAs should lead in the design of flexible approaches for improving teaching and learning for LEP students. Such approaches might operate on a continuum from content-based ESL at one end to dual language programs of instruction for LEP and other students at the other end. These programs should ignore artificial and misleading labels such as transitional bilingual education, developmental bilingual education, special alternative instructional programs, and immersion programs.

SEAs should be expected to provide leadership in the use of education technologies to document state-level program accountability on the basis of performance standards (student achievement), performance indicators (program-level accomplishments data), and the collective impact of bilingual education programs on the state's systemic school reform objectives.

SEAs should also guide schools in the use of the best management, professional development, research, and quality control practices used in corporate America to help schools develop and operate fiscally and educationally sound programs.

Finally, SEAs should offer leadership in matching schools with funding sources and helping them comply with funding criteria. This includes conducting technical reviews of proposals from LEAs to improve their competitiveness.

WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT FROM INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (IHEs)?

First, we should expect leadership in helping schools with higher concentrations of LEP students to develop systemic reform plans and integrate the activities into the university course work, research, and practica for teacher interns.

IHEs should also work with SEAs and school districts to increase the type and number of school staff provided to improve teaching and learning. This includes efforts to provide interdisciplinary training programs and dual language professional development degree or certification programs as the norm.

IHEs should also be conducting research and committing resources, in cooperation with private industry, to develop curriculum, education, and school management software for use in schools and universities.

They should also take a leadership role in operating school personnel professional development programs closely linked to schoolwide bilingual education programs. This includes programs and efforts to improve the multicultural competencies of all school staff to effectively serve linguistically and culturally diverse student and family populations.

IHEs should lead in hiring and training multicultural and bilingual faculty members who have significant experience in schools and can mentor school staff in the development and implementation of responsive school reform plans.

Finally, IHEs should develop staff exchange programs with SEAs and schools to help refine systemic reform plans, including mentoring opportunities for school and IHE faculties.

WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT FROM PARENTS AND OTHER COMMUNITY MEMBERS?

First, we should be responsible for making schools and schooling a top community priority. We should insist that schools place academic scholarship at the core of every activity, from athletics to the fine arts.

Parents should provide positive models of behavior. The objective might not be a return to an "age of innocence," as much as a retreat from what has been called the current "age of offense," where many are offensive and too many others are unnecessarily offended.

Parents and community members should actively participate in the implementation of state and school reform plans by playing a role in verifying that teaching and learning opportunities are being equitably provided to all students.

They should promote the benefits of bilingualism and multiculturalism as resources for sustaining communities and valuable skills for the national and international marketplace. They can also provide the leadership to ensure that home and community cultural knowledge and practice are significantly represented in the school's curriculum and professional development efforts, including the use of native and second languages and cultural information for teaching and learning.

Finally, parents and community members can actively support financing strategies that result in increased funding for schools and that ensure the fair distribution of the resources needed to implement reform plans.

WHAT SHOULD WE EXPECT FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ED) AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES?

First, we should expect ED and other agencies to take the lead in the full implementation of national voluntary curriculum, performance, and opportunity-to-learn standards.

ED should be expected to develop a federal-wide strategy to increase collaborative efforts and help recipients pool the fiscal and technical resources of the departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Labor, and other agencies such as the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

ED should also take the lead in funding the development and implementation of state reform

plans. This also calls for assisting in the development of comprehensive state plans that combine the resources targeted for health, welfare, and workforce training reform efforts.

ED should lead in designing and funding responsive research and development efforts that are directly linked to school needs and expectations. This includes the timely translation of research and evaluation findings into guidance to schools.

ED should also be expected to implement its "Consolidated Strategic Plan" that makes clear its mission and the roles and expectations of each of its principal offices, and describes related indicators of performance. This document could become the blueprint for reform envisioned for all schools, IHEs, SEAs, and communities.

ED should lead in the implementation of comprehensive national assessments and surveys of populations served by federal programs that accommodate LEP persons. The result might be accurate national report cards that describe the achievements of all students and schools.

ED should also lead in providing technical assistance through regional centers whose purpose is to link SEAs, schools, and other agencies to achieve high performance and management standards and, in turn, help students achieve to high academic standards. This includes assistance in developing language-appropriate assessment strategies to gauge the progress of LEP students.

Finally, ED should provide flexible funding criteria, regulations, and broad definitions of eligible student populations across programs such as Title I (currently Chapter 1), Even Start, Migrant Education, and others; Title II (professional development and technical assistance); Title III (technology, gifted and talented education); Title VI (Indian education); and Title VII (bilingual and immigrant education). This means that schools with LEP students will be able to use multi-source funding to operate bilingual education and other programs of instruction for LEP students and their English proficient peers, to provide professional development for all school staff, and to collect performance data from student cohorts that are representative of whole schools and whole districts. This does not mean, however, that ED should cease to act as an oversight agency.

IMAGINE THE YEAR 2000

When the reauthorized ESEA is fully implemented, then in the year 2000 we can imagine the following reforms becoming a reality:

- Title I, state, and local funds supporting the development and implementation of the general schoolwide and districtwide improvement plan for all communities, but especially for high poverty communities;
- Title II funds directly and indirectly supporting professional development activities for all school staff;
- Title III and other funds supporting the purchase and use of education hardware and software technologies;
- Title VII and other funds providing additional support for districtwide or schoolwide bilingual education programs, including additional professional development and evaluation activities; and
- Title II regional centers working in partnership with the SEAs and ED to provide the technical assistance needed to design and implement systemic school reform plans and evaluations of bilingual education programs and other services.

We can also imagine bilingual education programs that are implemented over a long enough period of time to ensure their full effect and adjusted to students with the following needs:

- native born students who are mostly English speaking but want to formally reacquire their family background language;

- native born students who are not fully proficient in English;
- non-U.S.-born students who are LEP;
- students who represent significant numbers of speakers of the same language; and
- students who represent small numbers of speakers of varied non-English languages.

This commitment to reform can mean that the duration of bilingual education programs is determined by teaching and learning requirements, rather than by state assessment policies that require student testing in English-only in particular grades, without regard to whether such students have learned enough English to demonstrate their growth in content skills and their application, or before the programs have had their full education effects.

School districts will be able to conduct such programs in the context of state and local reform plans that have been created by consensus of all important participants. The result will be comprehensive, clearly defined, and unified approaches to bilingual education that are not evident today. Finally, our communities will be able to reap the benefits of schools when they are truly operating as a system that links teaching, learning, professional development, and student and staff certifications of achievement to challenging and clearly defined curriculum and performance standards for students and staff.

This can be the reality of comprehensive programs of bilingual education: programs that are additive rather than remedial, that nurture the linguistic and cultural diversity of all students rather than deny the importance and usefulness of their characteristics and needs, that operate as a continuum across all grades from preschool to postsecondary levels and into the workplace, and that extend to new limits the conceptual and theoretical bases.

In the past, some observers have asked if bilingual education works. The vision outlined here is more possible now than ever before, given the commitment to school reform that is being made by the government and dedicated educators. In the year 2000, perhaps we can be in the position to declare that the conditions for effective programs of bilingual education have been met.

REFERENCES

Aleman, S. R. (1993). *Bilingual education act: Background and reauthorization issues,* CRS Report for Congress No. 93-119 EPW. Washington DC: U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Collier, V. (1992). "A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement," *Bilingual Research Journal,* 16/1&2, pp. 187-212.

Edwards, D. (1993, July). "Systemic reform and reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act," *Forum,* 16, 5. Washington, DC: NCBE.

Fleischman, H. L., and Hopstock, P. J. *Descriptive study of services to limited English proficient students.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning, unpublished tabulations.

Fullan, M. G., and Miles, M. B. (1992, June). "Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't." *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Stanford Working Group on Federal Education Programs for Limited English Proficient Students. (1993, June 14). *Federal education programs for limited English-proficient students: A blueprint for the second generation.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Knapp, M., Zucker, A., Adelman, N., and St. John, M. (1991). *The Eisenhower mathematics and science education program: An enabling resource for reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Milk, R., Mercado, C., and Sapiens, A. (1992). *Rethinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools.* Focus Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, Number 6. Washington, DC: NCBE.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (1993, January). "Efforts underway to develop national education standards." *Forum*, 16, 2. Washington, DC: Author.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (1993, January). "NABE, TESOL release bilingual education standards." *Forum*, 16, 2. Washington, DC: Author.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (1993, January). "National leaders surveyed on education reform movement." *Forum*, 16, 2. Washington, DC: Author.

O'Day, J., and Smith, M. (1993). "Systemic school reform and educational opportunity." In S. Fuhrman (Ed.), *Designing coherent education policy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Puma, M. J. et al. (February 1993). *Prospects: The congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity: Interim report.* Bethesda, MD: ABT Associates.

Ramirez, J. D. et al. (1991). *Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education program for language minority children.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning.

Strang, W. E., and Carlson, E. (1991). *Providing Chapter 1 service to limited English-proficient students.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning.

Talbert, J. E. (1992). "New strategies for developing our nation's teacher force and ancillary staff with a special emphasis on the implications for Chapter 1." Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *Improving America's schools act of 1993: Reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act.* Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (1991). Annual evaluation report: Fiscal year 1991. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (1993). *Reinventing Chapter 1: The current Chapter 1 program and new directions*, final report of the national assessment of the Chapter 1 program. Washington, DC: Author.

NOTE

Bilingual Education: A Look to the Year 2000 was the keynote presentation at a live, interactive teleconference sponsored by Multifunctional Resource Center 14 (MRC-14) on December 6, 1993. Garcia's address was followed by a panel session featuring: Robert Aguilar, Superintendent, Norwalk-LaMirada Unified School District; David Ramirez, Director, Center for Language Minority Education and Research, California State University, Long Beach; and Maria Trejo, Director, Categorical Programs Division, California Department of Education. An open session closed the conference, with Garcia and the panelists responding to call-in questions from the field.

FROM THE NCBE DATABASE

The following list of publications was compiled through a search of the NCBE database. The focuses on issues relating to the National Education Goals, education standards, and school reform.

Publications with BExxxxxx reference numbers are available from NCBE. These items can be ordered by using the publication order form included at the end of this monograph.

- The National Governors Association, Task Force on Education. (1990). *Educating America: State strategies for achieving the national education goals.* Washington, DC: Author.
  Available from: National Governors Association, 444 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001-1572

This report outlines strategies to enable states to meet the six National Education Goals adopted by the nation's governors. Measures are recommended in three phases of education: preschool years, elementary and secondary years, and adult education and training. The report also sets forth strategies to promote the national goal of having U.S. students be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement by the year 2000. The role of state governors in these efforts is discussed, along with the need for national leadership in education reform. Appendices present the National Education Goals and a bibliography of works consulted.

- National Education Goals Panel. (1991). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners.* Washington, DC: Author.
  Available from: National Education Goals Panel, 1850 M Street, NW, Suite 270, Washington, DC 20036; 202/632-0952.

This first annual report presents indicators to answer the question of how well the nation and individual states are doing in achieving each of the National Education Goals set forth by the President and the nation's governors in 1989. Data is presented on high school completion rates, math and science achievement, competency and achievement in core subjects, literacy, and incidence of school crime and drug use. Additional information related to achieving the goals and their associated objectives is also provided. Significant gaps in data are highlighted and proposals for creating new indicators are summarized. Finally, the role of the federal government in helping achieve the goals is described.

- National Council on Education Standards and Testing. (1992). *Raising standards for American education: A report to Congress, the secretary of education, the national education goals panel, and the American people.* Washington, DC: Author.
  Available from: U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954; 202/783-3238.

This report argues that instituting explicit national standards for academic performance tied to a new system of assessment would help the nation to meet the National Education Goals. Concerned that expectations for academic achievement in the United States are low as compared to other nations, the council maintains that national standards would provide a common anchor for systemic educational reforms. Five content areas would be targeted: English, mathematics, science, history, and geography. Parts 1 and 2 of the report address the desirability and feasibility of creating national standards and a system of assessment to measure progress toward those standards. Part 3 examines the question of how the standards and assessment system would be developed and implemented. Appendices include acknowledgments; authorization for the National Council on Education Standards and Testing; public comment; the National Education Goals; and reports of the task forces on standards, assessment, implementation, English, mathematics, science, history, and geography.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *Preparing young children for success: Guideposts for achieving our first national education goal.* Washington, DC: Author.
Available from: NCBE (BE018789).

This booklet discusses issues surrounding the first of the National Education Goals—that by the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn. It examines the major issues having to do with the definition of terms and implementation strategies, and proposes policies and practices related to these issues. The focus is on children learning in the home, in preschool, and in early elementary school. Within the goal, three separate objectives are discussed in turn: (1) All disadvantaged and disabled children will have access to high quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs; (2) Every parent will be a child's first teacher and all parents will have access to the training and support they need; (3) Children will receive the nutrition and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies, and the number of low birthweight babies will be reduced through prenatal health care. A discussion of the federal role in helping to achieve the readiness goal is also included. A list of references is appended.

White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. (1992). *A progress report to the Secretary of Education from the President's Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
Available from: NCBE (BE018796).

This report describes the progress of Hispanic Americans in the United States toward achieving the National Education Goals. Input was received from citizens at six regional public forums, as well as from representatives of national Hispanic organizations. The document includes: (1) a snapshot of the status of Hispanics in relation to the National Education Goals; (2) the Commission's ongoing efforts to gather relevant information and expert opinion; (3) an analysis of the challenge the nation faces in providing Hispanics with a quality education; (4) a statement of the Commission's vision for the major areas it is addressing, including parent participation and educational partnerships; and (5) the Commission's proposed next steps for carrying out its responsibilities and for increasing accountability in both government and the education community to ensure that progress is made. An appendix contains additional information on Hispanic participation in education programs and demographic, socioeconomic, and health profiles of Hispanic Americans.

Council of the Great City Schools. (1992). *National urban education goals: Baseline indicators, 1990-91.* Washington, DC: Author.
Available from: Council of the Great City Schools, 1413 K Street, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005; 202/371-0163.

This report presents a series of data measuring the status of urban schools in relation to the national urban education goals. It focuses on results-oriented indicators rather than on programmatic ones, although some gross program participation data are included. Chapter 1 presents data on the demographics of city schools and compares urban characteristics to those of the nation at large. Chapter 2 is divided into six sections, each devoted to one of the national urban education goals and each presenting data aggregated across all urban school districts for the 1990-91 school year. The six goals deal with the following areas: (1) readiness to learn; (2) increased graduation rates; (3) improved academic achievement; (4) quality teachers; (5) postsecondary opportunities; (6) safe and caring environment. Chapter 3 contains information on various characteristics of urban public schools that might be of general interest. Chapter 4 presents data on the revenues and expenditures of urban schools, with comparisons to national averages. These chapters are followed by a description of data strengths and limitations, and a summary of future plans. Finally,

the report contains city-by-city profiles with data on demographics, the six goals, system characteristics, and funding.

National Education Goals Panel. (1992). *The national education goals report: Building a nation of learners.* Washington, DC: Author. *Available from: National Education Goals Panel, 1850 M Street, NW, Suite 270, Washington, DC 20036; 202/632-0952.*

This is the second in a series of annual reports that measures the nation's progress in meeting the six National Education Goals. The report begins with a special section of international comparative data showing how the United States' performance on the various goals compares to that of other nations. Chapter 2 presents basic data on progress toward the goals, including key indicators, additional indicators, and individual state profiles for 1992. The latter section reports the most recent state data across the goals alongside a baseline statistic. Chapter 3 summarizes the panel's progress during the past year in stimulating data reforms needed to improve the information provided in each goal area. The final chapter describes federal efforts to support the National Education Goals. Financial data reported in 1991 are updated and new contextual information is presented.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary. (1992). *The condition of bilingual education in the nation: A report to the Congress and the President.* Washington, DC: Author. *Available from: NCBE (BE018765).*

This document reports on programmatic, research, and training activities administered by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). It describes the coordination of OBEMLA programs with other offices within the Department of Education and with other federal agencies and programs. It also identifies and discusses key aspects of education programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students. The report begins with a brief legislative background of the Bilingual Education Act and a discussion of how bilingual education relates to the six National Education Goals. Chapter 2 provides a discussion of the identification, placement, and demographic characteristics of LEP students. Chapter 3 describes the results of research studies on LEP instructional strategies, program evaluations, capacity building, and the training of educational personnel. Chapter 4 focuses on the role of OBEMLA in administering programs authorized by the Bilingual Education Act. Chapter 5 presents a policy analysis and recommendations for future federal involvement.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning. (1992). *Transforming American education: A directory of research and practice to help the nation achieve the six national education goals.* Washington, DC: Author. *Available from: NCBE (BE018913).*

This directory documents successful and promising programs around the country that are helping students progress toward achieving the National Education Goals. Each chapter focuses on a key topic or content area cited in the National Education Goals: early childhood education, dropout prevention, English language arts, mathematics, science, history, geography, foreign languages, adult education and literacy, vocational-technical education, and drug abuse prevention. Each chapter includes four parts:

1) a summary of current thinking and research in the topic area, with a focus on practices and programs found to be effective;
2) a suggested reading list of key books, reports, and articles on the topic;
3) case studies of innovative and promising projects currently under way; and
4) sources of further information.

Center for Applied Linguistics (Ed.). (1993). *Issues of language and culture: Proceedings of a symposium convened by the Center for Applied Linguistics on national education goal 3.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Available from: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC; 202/429-9292.

The papers presented at the 1992 symposium consider language and culture issues that have been neglected in the movement to raise education standards as mandated by the National Education Goals. The symposium focused on Goal 3, which calls for students to demonstrate competency in specific content areas, and on the impact of national standards and assessments on students from linguistic and cultural minority groups. An initial overview sets the conference proceedings into the larger context of cultural diversity and education reform. Next, the questions of how standards can be raised and student performance measured equitably are considered. Current research issues in minority student education are discussed briefly. The document concludes with a summary of policy and strategy recommendations that emerged from the symposium. A list of resources citing materials related to multicultural education, teacher training, teacher certification, and testing and standards is appended.

Prince, C. D., and Lawrence, L. A. (1993). *School readiness and language minority students: Implications of the first national education goal.* Washington, DC: NCBE.
Available from: NCBE (BE019044).

This document examines conditions affecting the school readiness of young children, with special attention to the needs of children whose home language is not English. It summarizes progress made by the National Education Goals Panel in defining and measuring school readiness, and raises questions regarding the assessment of young language minority children. Next, the report analyzes conditions affecting young children's prospects for success in school, including access to preschool programs, parent training and support, and adequate nutrition and health care. Language learning during the preschool years is discussed. Finally, the document lists 15 things that parents can do to help their children get ready for school and recommends six immediate policy measures to address the needs of young language minority students.

Wurtz, E., and Malcolm, S. (1993). *Promises to keep: Creating high standards for American students. Report on the review of education standards from the goals 3 and 4 technical planning group.* Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.
Available from: NCBE (BE019283).

The National Education Goals Panel, established in 1991 to measure progress toward the National Education Goals, convened a technical planning group to offer guidance on the process of establishing world-class academic standards in the United States. This report by the planning group indicates initial steps for reviewing and certifying the education standards currently being developed by independent professional organizations. Criteria and processes are suggested for reviewing two kinds of education standards: (1) content standards, including subject-specific content standards and state content standards; and (2) performance standards. The report outlines challenges for the future National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) in terms of criteria and processes that NESIC should use to review and certify content standards, with implications for performance standards. Responses are offered to various concerns about standards expressed by the public. Finally, comments by two members of the technical planning group are presented. Appendices contain biographic sketches of group members; profiles of national content standard development projects; a paper on setting standards in other countries; an executive summary, *Raising Standards for American Education;* and a chapter from the 1993 Goals Report.

RESOURCE ORGANIZATIONS

Alliance for Curriculum Reform
2000 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201
Phone: 703/525-4035; Fax: 703/243-8316

American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Center for Restructuring
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
202/879-4461

Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools
University of Wisconsin, Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 659
Madison, WI 53706
608/263-7575

Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
The School of Arts and Sciences
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
410/338-7570

Institute for Responsive Education
605 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
617/353-3309

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
1900 M Street, NW, Suite 210
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202/463-3008; Fax: 202/463-3008

National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning
University of California, Santa Cruz
399 Kerr Hall
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
Phone: 408/459-3500; Fax: 408/459-3502

National Education Association, National Center for Innovation
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20046
202/822-7370

National Education Goals Panel
1850 M Street, NW, Suite 270
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202/632-0952; Fax: 202/632-0957

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
215/574-9300

CONTENT STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

(Source: Wurtz & Malcolm. (1993). *Promises to keep.* See citation and abstract, page 12.)

The Arts

Music Educators National Conference
1806 Robert Fulton Drive
Reston, VA 22091
John Mahlmann, Standards Project Director

In coordination with the American Alliance for Theater and Education, the National Art Education Association, and the National Dance Association.

The standards are scheduled to be completed Summer 1994. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, contact: Megan Prosser at (703) 860-4000 or FAX (703) 860-4826.

Citizenship and Civics

Center of Civic Education
5146 Douglas Fir Road
Calabasas, CA 91302-1467
Charles Quigley, Standards Project Director
Margaret Branson, Co-Director

The Standards are scheduled to be completed Fall 1994. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, contact: Margaret Branson at (818) 591-9321, FAX (818) 591-9330.

English and Language Arts

The Center for the Study of Reading
174 Children's Research Center
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820
P. David Pearso; Allen Farstrup (IRA); Miles Myers (NCTE)

In coordination with the National Council of Teachers or English (NCTE) and the International Reading Association (IRA).

The standards are scheduled to be completed Fall 1995. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, contact Jean Osborn at (217) 333-2552 or FAX (217) 244-4501.

Foreign Languages

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc.
6 Executive Plaza
Yonkers, NY 10701-6801
June K. Phillips, Standards Project Director

In coordination with the American Association of Teachers of French, the American Association of Teachers of German, and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese.

The standards are scheduled to be completed Spring 1996. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, contact Jamie Draper at (914) 963-8830 or FAX (914) 963-1275.

Geography

National Council of Geographic Education
Geography Standards Project
1600 M Street, NW, Suite 2611
Washington, DC 20036
Anthony R. DeSouza, Project Director

In coordination with the Association of American Geographers, the National Geographic Society, and the American Geographical Society.

The standards are scheduled to be completed Fall 1994. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, contact Heather Scofield at (202) 775-7832 or FAX (202) 429-5771.

History

National Center for History in the Schools
University of California, Los Angeles
231 Moore Hall, 405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Charlotte Crabtree, Project Co-Director
Gary B. Nash, Project Co-Director

The standards are scheduled to be completed Spring 1994. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, contact: Pamela Hamilton at (310) 825-4702 or FAX (310) 825-4723.

Mathematics

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
1906 Association Drive
Reston, VA 20091-1593
Thomas Romberg, Standards Commission Chair

The standards were completed in March 1989. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on assessment initiatives, contact: Virginia Williams at (703) 620-9840 or FAX (703) 476-2970.

Science

National Academy of Sciences
National Research Council
201 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20418
Ken Hoffman, Project Co-Director
Angelo Collins, Project Co-Director

In coordination with the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Association of Physics Teachers, the American Chemical Society, the Council of State Science Supervisors, the Earth Science Coalition, and the National Association of Biology Teachers.

The standards are scheduled to be completed Fall 1994. For draft copies, other materials, or information about opportunities to comment on the standards, phone: (202) 334-1399 or FAX (202) 334-3159.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1994 - 347-781/80294

OTHER TITLES AVAILABLE FROM NCBE

Titles in NCBE's Focus Occasional Paper and Program Information Guide series are available for $3.50 per copy. To order any of the titles listed below, circle their number(s), provide the information requested below, and detach and mail this page, along with your check or purchase order, to: **NCBE Orders, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.**

FOCUS OCCASIONAL PAPERS

8. **Distance Learning: The Challenge for a Multicultural Society.** Aida Barrera, 1993.
7. **School Readiness and Language Minority Students: Implications of the First National Education Goal.** Cynthia D. Prince & Leslie A. Lawrence, 1993.
6. **Re-Thinking the Education of Teachers of Language Minority Children: Developing Reflective Teachers for Changing Schools.** Robert Milk, Carmen Mercado & Alexander Sapiens, 1992.
5. **Programs for Secondary LEP Students: A California Study.** Catherine Minicucci & Laurie Olsen, 1992.
4. **Teaching and Testing Achievement: The Role of Language Development.** Muriel Saville-Troike, 1991.
3. **Bilingual Education: A Focus on Current Research.** Stephen D. Krashen, 1991.
2. **Early Childhood Programs for Language Minority Children.** Helen Nissani, 1990.
1. **Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: A Research Perspective.** Kenji Hakuta, 1990.

PROGRAM INFORMATION GUIDES

16. **Multicultural Education: Strategies for Linguistically Diverse Schools and Classrooms.** Deborah Menkart, 1993.
15. **Reforming Mathematics Instruction for ESL Literacy Students.** Keith Buchanan & Mary Helman, 1993.
14. **Applying Elements of Effective Secondary Schooling for Language Minority Students.** Tamara Lucas, 1993.
13. **The Literacy Club: A Cross-age Tutoring/Paired Reading Project.** Barbara Cook & Carol Urzua, 1993.
12. **Cooperative Learning in the Secondary School: Maximizing Language Acquisition, Academic Achievement, and Social Development.** Dan D. Holt, Barbara Chips & Diane Wallace, 1992.
11. **Teaching Science to English Learners, Grades 4-8.** Ann K. Fathman, Mary Ellen Quinn & Carolyn Kessler, 1992.
10. **Writer's Workshop and Children Acquiring English as a Non-Native Language.** Katharine Davies Samway, 1992.
9. **Performance and Portfolio Assessment for Language Minority Students.** Lorraine Valdez Pierce & J. Michael O'Malley, 1992.
8. **The Newcomer Program: Helping Immigrant Students Succeed in U.S. Schools.** Monica Friedlander, 1991.
7. **Integrating Language and Content Instruction: Strategies and Techniques.** Deborah J. Short, 1991.
6. **Fostering Home-School Cooperation: Involving Language Minority Families as Partners in Education.** Emma Violand-Sánchez, Christine P. Sutton & Herbert W. Ware, 1991.
5. **School Based Management: What Bilingual and ESL Program Directors Should Know.** Denise McKeon & Lynn Malarz, 1991.
4. **Using Interpreters and Translators to Meet the Needs of Handicapped Language Minority Students and Their Families.** Sandra H. Fradd & Diane K. Wilen, 1990.
3. **Informal Assessment in Evaluation of Educational Programs: Implications for Bilingual Education Programs.** Cecilia Navarrete et al., 1990.
2. **Integrating Learning Styles and Skills in the ESL Classrooms: An Approach to Lesson Planning.** Emma Violand Hainer et al., 1990.
1. **Helping Language Minority Students After They Exit From Bilingual/ESL Programs: A Handbook for Teachers.** Else V. Hamayan & Ron Perlman, 1990.

IN THIS PUBLICATION

___ BE018789 ($2.80) ___ BE018913 ($27.20)

___ BE018796 ($6.70) ___ BE019044 ($3.50)

___ BE018765 ($8.00) ___ BE019283 ($7.00)

ORDER INFORMATION

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

_____

Phone: _____

_____ **TOTAL ORDER**

detach here

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gilbert Narro Garcia is Acting Director, Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE), Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), U.S. Department of Education. Prior to this, Garcia was an Education Program Specialist for the Imporvement of Practice with the Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). During his tenure with OERI, Garcia was also a member of the Education and Work Staff and the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program Team, which was convened by the Secretary of Education.

Garcia's other experience includes Manager of Research and Evaluation at OBEMLA, senior research staff member at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), adjunct lecturer, instructor, and teacher. He is an ABD doctoral candidate in applied linguistics and anthropology at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

ED/OBEMLA94-2

FOCUS

BILINGUAL EDUCATION::
A LOOK TO THE YEAR 2000

Bilingual Education: A Look to the Year 2000, is based on a lecture delivered by the author in at the Interactive Teleconference sponsored by the Title VII Multifunctional Resource Center No. 14 at California State Polytechnic University–Pomona. The teleconference was broadcast live on December 6, 1993.

In this monograph, the author offers his vision of the future of education for language minority students based upon proposed legislation and other government initiatives.

NCBE

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1118 22nd Street NW Washington DC 20037